



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,039	02/14/2006	Takashi Hirokawa	145085	7330
25944 7590 11/17/2010 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
CHUI, MEI PING				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1616				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/17/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com
jarnstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/543,039

Applicant(s)

HIROKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

MEI-PING CHUI

Art Unit

1616

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/22)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Action

Receipt of Amendments/Remarks filed on 08/18/2010 is acknowledged. Claims 1, 3-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9 have been amended; claim 2 has been currently cancelled.

Applicants' claim amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, this action is made final.

Status of Claims

Accordingly, claims **1 and 3-14** are presented for examination on the merits for patentability.

Rejection(s) not reiterated from the previous Office Action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections presently being applied to the instant application.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1616

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

(1) Claims 1, 3, 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misselbrook, J. (U. S. Patent No. 4,511,395) in view of Becher et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,908,882).

Applicants Claim

Applicants claim an agricultural and horticultural water dispersible granule comprising: (i) an agricultural chemical compound having a melting or softening point 70 °C or below; (ii) an adsorbent carrier; (iii) a salt of N-acylamino acid that has an acyl group having 8-24 carbon atoms; and additional constituents: (iv) formaldehyde condensates of aromatic sulfonates or lignosulfonates and (v) N-acylmethyltaurate that has an acyl group having 8-24 carbon atoms.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art

(MPEP 2141.01)

Misselbrook, J. teaches a method of preparing water-dispersible granular and wettable powder compositions comprising high concentration of low melting pesticidal compounds and swelling hydrous aluminum silicate clays (column 2, lines 33-38).

Misselbrook, J. teaches that the water-dispersible granular composition comprises: (i) 50-70 % by weight of a low melting active compound of the formula (I), which have a melting point below 100 °C; (ii) 2-7.5 % by weight of N-methyl-N-oleoyltaurate as wetting agent; (iii) 2-6 % by weight of sodium lignin sulfonate or sodium salt of a naphthalene sulfonic acid-formaldehyde condensate as dispersing agent (column 8, claim 10).

More specifically, Misselbrook, J. teaches that the low melting pesticidal compounds used in the water-dispersible composition are dinitroaniline herbicides, i.e. N-(1-ethylpropyl)-2,6-dinitro-3,4-xylidine (commonly referred to as pendimethalin which has a melting point of 47-58 °C) or α,α,α -trifluoro-2,6-dinitro-N,N-dipropyl-p-toluidine (commonly referred to as trifluralin which has a melting point of 48.5 °C) (column 3, Table 1).

Misselbrook, J. also teaches that because the dinitroaniline herbicides have melting points below 100 °C, they tend to cake, fuse or lump up when stored at or exposed to elevated temperatures due to the excessive softening or partial melting property; therefore, water-dispersible compositions generally would contain solid inert carrier, i.e. kaolin, montmorillonite, attapulgite, diatomaceous earth and hydrated sodium silicoaluminate. Misselbrook, J. further teaches that, besides the conventional solid insert carriers set forth above, natural swelling hydrous aluminum silicate clays (also referred to as bentonite clay) can be used to provide a free-flowing, non-agglomerate, non-lump up or fuse characteristics when stored or exposed to elevated temperature over a prolong period of time (column 1, lines 46-58; column 2, lines 27-41).

Art Unit: 1616

Misselbrook, J. also teaches that the water-dispersible granular composition contains the swelling clays exhibits superior dispersibility and disintegration property than those containing non-swelling clays (column 5-6, Table III and Table IV).

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

Misselbrook, J. does not teach the inclusion of an N-acylamino acid into the composition, as claimed. However, the deficiency is cured by Becher et al.

Becher et al. teach a herbicidal composition comprising a glyphosate herbicide and two surfactants, wherein the second surfactant is an anionic N-acyl derivative of an amino acid or a salt thereof (column 3, line 11-13). Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be a dry solid formulation, i.e. granule that is water-dispersible (column 7, line 51-54).

Becher et al. teach the second surfactant is in the form of an acid having a hydrophobic C₈₋₂₄-acyl moiety derived from a fatty acid, i.e. lauroyl, myristoyl, palmitoyl, linoleoyl, linolenoyl, stearoyl or oleoyl, and the amino acid moiety of said N-acyl amino acid includes sarcosine, glutamic acid, alanine, aspartic acid, glycine, isoleucine, leucine and valine (column 6, lines 2-5, 15-16, 42, 48 and 59-61).

Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be formulated into a dry solid formulation, i.e. a water-dispersible granule or powder composition, and can help to enhance herbicidal activity of the herbicide (column 7, lines 51-55).

Finding of prima facie obviousness Rational and Motivation

(MPEP 2142-2143)

Art Unit: 1616

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Misselbrook, J. with Becher et al. to arrive at the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate an N-acylamino acid into the composition because the prior art Becher et al. teaches that N-acylamino acid is known as anionic surfactant and can be used in combination with other ingredients to produce a water-dispersible granule for enhancing the herbicidal activity of the composition.

With respect to the amount of N-acylamino acid as claimed in the composition, it would be dependent on the selected herbicide, based on the weight ratio of the anionic surfactant with other ingredients taught in the prior art, and it would have been obvious for normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages.

From the teaching of the references, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

(2) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misselbrook, J. (U. S. Patent No. 4,511,395) in view of Becher et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,908,882), and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,523,276).

Applicants Claim

Applicants claim an agricultural and horticultural water dispersible granule comprising: (i) an agricultural chemical compound having a melting of softening point 70 °C or below, i.e. i.e. esprocarb or pretilachlor; (ii) an adsorbent carrier; (iii) a salt of N-acylamino acid that has an acyl group having 8-24 carbon atoms;

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art***(MPEP 2141.01)***

Misselbrook, J. teaches a method of preparing water-dispersible granular and wettable powder compositions comprising high concentration of low melting pesticidal compounds and swelling hydrous aluminum silicate clays (column 2, lines 33-38).

Misselbrook, J. teaches that the water-dispersible granular composition comprises: (i) 50-70 % by weight of a low melting active compound of the formula (I), which have a melting point below 100 °C; (ii) 2-7.5 % by weight of N-methyl-N-oleoyltaurate as wetting agent; (iii) 2-6 % by weight of sodium lignin sulfonate or sodium salt of a naphthalene sulfonic acid-formaldehyde condensate as dispersing agent (column 8, claim 10).

More specifically, Misselbrook, J. teaches that the low melting pesticidal compounds used in the water-dispersible composition are dinitroaniline herbicides, i.e. N-(1-ethylpropyl)-2,6-dinitro-3,4-xylidine (commonly referred to as pendimethalin which has a melting point of 47-58 °C) or α,α,α -trifluoro-2,6-dinitro-N,N-dipropyl-p-toluidine (commonly referred to as trifluralin which has a melting point of 48.5 °C) (column 3, Table 1).

Misselbrook, J. also teaches that because the dinitroaniline herbicides have melting points below 100 °C, they tend to cake, fuse or lump up when stored at or exposed to elevated temperatures due to the excessive softening or partial melting property; therefore, water-dispersible compositions generally would contain solid inert carrier, i.e. kaolin, montmorillonite, attapulgite, diatomaceous earth and hydrated sodium silicoaluminate. Misselbrook, J. further teaches that, besides the conventional solid insert carriers set forth above, natural swelling hydrous aluminum silicate clays (also referred to as bentonite clay) can be used to provide a free-flowing, non-agglomerate, non-lump up or fuse characteristics when stored or exposed to elevated temperature over a prolonged period of time (column 1, lines 46-58; column 2, lines 27-41).

Misselbrook, J. also teaches that the water-dispersible granular composition contains the swelling clays exhibits superior dispersibility and disintegration property than those containing non-swelling clays (column 5-6, Table III and Table IV).

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

Misselbrook, J. does not teach the inclusion of an N-acylamino acid, as claimed. However, the deficiency is cured by Becher et al.

Becher et al. teach a herbicidal composition comprising a glyphosate herbicide and two surfactants, wherein the second surfactant is an anionic N-acyl derivative of an amino acid or a salt thereof (column 3, line 11-13). Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be a dry solid formulation, i.e. granule that is water-dispersible (column 7, line 51-54).

Becher et al. teach the second surfactant is in the form of an acid having a hydrophobic C₈₋₂₄-acyl moiety derived from a fatty acid, i.e. lauroyl, myristoyl, palmitoyl, linoleoyl, linolenoyl, stearoyl or oleoyl, and the amino acid moiety of said N-acyl amino acid includes sarcosine, glutamic acid, alanine, aspartic acid, glycine, isoleucine, leucine and valine (column 6, lines 2-5, 15-16, 42, 48 and 59-61).

Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be formulated into a dry solid formulation, i.e. a water-dispersible granule or powder composition, and can help to enhance herbicidal activity of the herbicide (column 7, lines 51-55).

Misselbrook, J. and Becher et al. combined do not exemplify the agricultural chemical compounds as claimed. However, the deficiency is cured by Suzuki et al.

Suzuki et al. teach a stable herbicidal composition which comprises sulfamoylurea in combination with one or more low-melting of liquid herbicides. Suzuki et al. teach that the herbicidal combination composition can be used to provide excellent control of a broad spectrum of grass and broadleaf weeds and sedge in the presence of growing, seeded or transplanted cereal crop plants, i.e. rice, wheat, barley, oats and rye, after prolonged storage (column 1, lines 43-54; column 9, claim 1). Suzuki et al. also teach that the low-melting herbicides are the herbicidal compounds with a melting point of 60°C or less and can be present in an amount of 1-65% by weight, wherein the suitable low-melting or liquid herbicidal agents include: dinitroaniline herbicides, i.e. pendimethalin, trifluralin; thiocarbamate herbicides, i.e. esprocarb, and chloroacetamide herbicides, i.e. butachlor, pretilachlor, metolachlor, alachlor (column 2, lines 11-19, 31-32; column 3, lines 2-3; column 9-10, claims 2, 6-16).

Suzuki et al. further teach that the stable herbicidal composition can be formulated in any of the conventional dry forms such as dusts, dust concentrates, wettable powders, fine granulars, granulars, water dispersible granulars and the like utilizing agronomically acceptable adjuvants including carriers, i.e. clay, talc, diatomaceous earth, bentonite, calcium carbonate, and the like; surfactants, i.e. ionic surfactants: alkylsulfate, alkylarylsulfonate, alkylsulfate ester, ligninsulfonate, alkylnaphthalene sulfonate formalin condensate, sulfate of polyoxyethylene alkylaryl ether, alkylamine salt, dialkylsulfosuccinate, polycarbonate and the like (column 3, lines 6-59).

Finding of prima facie obviousness Rational and Motivation

(MPEP 2142-2143)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Misselbrook, J. and Becher et al. with Suzuki et al. to arrive at the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate an N-acylamino acid into the composition because the prior art Becher et al. teaches that N-acylamino acid is known as anionic surfactant and can be used in combination with other ingredients to produce a water-dispersible granule for enhancing the herbicidal activity of the composition.

One of ordinary skill in the art also would have been motivated to substitute the low-melting herbicides taught in Misselbrook, J. with other low-melting herbicides taught by Suzuki et al. because they all have a low-melting profile and have been used in the

Art Unit: 1616

preparation of herbicidal water-dispersible granules. Thus, it would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use them interchangeably.

From the teaching of the references, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

(3) Claims 1, 3, 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,945,114) in view of Becher et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,908,882).

Applicants Claim

Applicants claim an agricultural and horticultural water dispersible granule comprising: (i) an agricultural chemical compound having a melting or softening point 70 °C or below; (ii) an adsorbent carrier, i.e. attapulgit or clays; (iii) a salt of N-acylamino acid that has an acyl group having 8-24 carbon atoms; and comprises additional constituents: (iv) formaldehyde condensates of aromatic sulfonates or lignosulfonates.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art

(MPEP 2141.01)

Ogawa et al. teach a water-dispersible granule comprising a pesticide having a melting point not more than 70 °C, a carrier and a surface-active agent, and the granule has superior physical properties, i.e. disintegration-in-water, dispersibility, suspensibility and storage stability, and is free of scaling off, collapse of the particles (column 1, lines

Art Unit: 1616

45-54, 60-64; column 3, line 12-13; column 6, lines 43-48; column 13, line 35 to column 14, line 3).

More specifically, Ogawa et al. teach that the low melting pesticide has a melting point in a range of 0 °C to 70 °C, i.e. α,α,α -trifluoro-2,6-dinitro-N,N-dipropyl-p-toluidine (also referred as trifluralin which melting point is 48.5 °C) and can be present in the water-dispersible granule in an amount of 5-50 % by weight (column 2, lines 47-48; column 5, lines 16, compound 66; lines 25-26).

Ogawa et al. teach that the water-dispersible granule can also include a surface active agent that can emulsify and disperse the pesticide. Example such as the anionic surfactant, i.e. sodium salt of naphthalenesulfonic acid/formalin condensate or lignosulfonates, and can be present in an amount of 5 to 30 %, preferably 6 to 20 %, by weight based on the weight of said water dispersible granule ((column 2, line 27, 30-31, 43-46).

Ogawa et al. further teach that mineral carrier, i.e. clays, diatomite or attapulgite, can be included in the water dispersible granule in an amount between 0.1 to 85 % by weight based on the weight of the granule (column 3, lines 12-17).

In addition, Ogawa et al. teach that the water-dispersible granule can also include a pesticide having a melting point higher than 70 °C, depending upon uses (column 5, lines 41-46).

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

Ogawa et al. do not teach the use of N-acylamino acid in the composition. However, the deficiency is cured by Becher et al.

Becher et al. teach a herbicidal composition comprising a glyphosate herbicide and two surfactants, wherein the second surfactant is an anionic N-acyl derivative of an amino acid or a salt thereof (column 3, line 11-13). Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be a dry solid formulation, i.e. granule that is water-dispersible (column 7, line 51-54).

Becher et al. teach the second surfactant is in the form of an acid having a hydrophobic C₈₋₂₄-acyl moiety derived from a fatty acid, i.e. lauroyl, myristoyl, palmitoyl, linoleoyl, linolenoyl, stearoyl or oleoyl, and the amino acid moiety of said N-acyl amino acid includes sarcosine, glutamic acid, alanine, aspartic acid, glycine, isoleucine, leucine and valine (column 6, lines 2-5, 15-16, 42, 48 and 59-61).

Becher et al. also teach that the composition can be formulated into a dry solid formulation, i.e. a water-dispersible granule or powder composition, and can help to enhance herbicidal activity of the herbicide (column 7, lines 51-55).

***Finding of prima facie obviousness Rational and Motivation
(MPEP 2142-2143)***

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogawa et al. with Becher et al. to arrive at the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate an N-acylamino acid into the composition because the prior art Becher et al. teaches that N-

Art Unit: 1616

acylamino acid is known as anionic surfactant and can be used in combination with other ingredients to produce a water-dispersible granule for enhancing the herbicidal activity of the composition.

With respect to the amount of N-acylamino acid as claimed in the composition, it would be dependent on the selected herbicide, based on the weight ratio of the anionic surfactant with other ingredients taught in the prior art, and it would have been obvious for normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages.

It is also noted that the instant claims are written using the transitional phrase “comprising”, which is fully open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements. Furthermore, the term “comprising” is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.

From the teaching of the references, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to the Arguments and Declaration

Applicants' arguments filed on 08/18/2010 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Applicants first argue that claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1616

non-rejected claim 2 (see Remarks: page 5, part A). The argument is not persuasive because the secondary reference, namely Becher et al., teaches the N-acylamino acid having an acyl hydrophobic group with 8-24 carbon atoms. Therefore, the teaching of Becher et al. meets the new claim limitation that is incorporated into the rejected claim 1. However, claims 3 and 5 are amended to depend from claim 1 now, and thus the necessitated a new ground of claim rejection.

Applicants next argue that the secondary reference, namely Tanaka et al., teaches the use of an anionic surfactant derived from L-glutamic acid which has herbicidal activity, not as a dispersant of the water-dispersible granule as required by the present invention (see Remarks: page 6, part B). The arguments have been considered, but they are mooted because the amended claim 1 now required the N-acylamino acid must have an acyl group with 8-24 carbon atom chain.

Applicants then argue that the reference, namely Ogawa et al., teaches beside the mineral carrier (which is a non-calcined precipitated hydrated silicon dioxide), a calcined product of precipitated hydrated silicon dioxide is required in their composition in order to produce the water-dispersible property of the granule. In contrast, the present composition uses the non-calcined precipitated hydrated silicon dioxide as carrier (e.g. CARPLEX 80 disclosed in Example 14) to produce a water dispersible granule and all underwater characteristics (see Remarks: page 7-8, part C). The arguments are not persuasive because the instant claims are written using the transitional phrase “comprising”, which is fully open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements. Furthermore, the term “comprising” is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and

Art Unit: 1616

still form a construct within the scope of the claim. Therefore, the additional component, i.e. the calcined product of precipitated hydrated silicon dioxide, as taught in Ogawa et al. can be included in the present granule. Furthermore, Applicants asserted in their Remarks (filed on 08/18/2010) that the object of the present invention is to improve water dispersible granules in physical ways, and for this improvement, the salts of N-acylamino acids are used (see Remarks: page 5, last line to page 6, lines 1-2). Therefore, it is obvious that the improved water-dispersible property of the present granule is not achieved by the adsorbent carrier (the non-calcined product of precipitated hydrated silicon dioxide), but is achieved by the addition of the salts of N-acylamino acids. Therefore, the reference of Ogawa et al. does not teach away the invention, but simply teaches the use of a combination of ingredients which are known and common in the agricultural field to produce a desirable water-dispersible granule.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this **final** action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

Art Unit: 1616

SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should direct to Helen Mei-Ping Chui whose telephone number is 571-272-9078. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am – 5:00 pm). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either PRIVATE PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through PRIVATE PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the PRIVATE PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/H. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 1616

*/Mina Haghighatian/
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1616*